

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto gov

CONFIRMATION NO. ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR 020269 03/04/2002 Isao Kameyama 10/086,701 03/18/2003 23850 7590 ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP EXAMINER 1725 K STREET, NW GRAY, DAVID M **SUITE 1000** WASHINGTON, DC 20006 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2851

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| · | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--------------|
| | Application | No. | Applicant(s) | |
| Office Action Summary | 10/086,701 | | KAMEYAMA, ISAO | |
| | Examiner | | Art Unit | |
| | David M Gray | | 2851 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply | pears on the co | over sneet with the c | orrespondence add | iress |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | 136(a). In no event, ly within the statutor; will apply and will exe, cause the applicat | however, may a reply be tim y minimum of thirty (30) days pire SIX (6) MONTHS from i ion to become ABANDONEI | ely filed will be considered timely he mailing date of this co (35 U.S.C. § 133). | mmunication. |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2002. | | | | |
| 2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☒ Th | This action is non-final. | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims | Ex parte Qua | yle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4 | 53 O.G. 213. | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | |
| 6) Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected. | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o | or election requ | uirement. | | |
| Application Papers | ~ * | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 March 2002</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | |
| 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | |
| a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: | | | | |
| 1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the price application from the International But the company of the certified copies of the price application from the International But the certified copies of the price application from the certified copies of the certified c | ureau (PCT Ru | ıle 17.2(a)). | | Stage |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | | · | | P 41 N |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | |
| a) | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 | 4) 5) <u>2</u> . 6) | Notice of Informal F | (PTO-413) Paper No(Patent Application (PTO | |

Application/Control Number: 10/086,701 Page 2

Art Unit: 2851

Claim Objections

1. Claims 6-13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

2. The claim limitation "baseplate having terminals and equipped with an auxiliary" renders the claims indefinite. It appears applicant intends to recite --auxiliary module--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DeLine et al. (6,124,886).
- 5. DeLine et al. discloses an "auxiliary module", carrier member 20, having a "plurality of busbars", circuit member 62 that is encapsulated therein. The circuit member 62 has electrical contact portions 66a-66b, 70a-70b, 66c-66d, 68a-68b and 68c-68d. Regarding claim 5, DeLine et al. discloses that circuit member 62 is formed as "stamped, metallic wire" and as shown in drawing figure 3 is clearly bent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Application/Control Number: 10/086,701

Art Unit: 2851

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Page 3

- 8. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the acknowledged prior art in view of Schultz, Jr. et al. (5,097,592).
- 9. The acknowledged prior art differs from the claimed invention as the acknowledged prior art uses a wiring harness and not the claimed "relaying component."
- 10. Schultz, Jr. et al. teaches "harnesses are difficult to handle by machine, making it difficult to automate either harness making or harness handling or to employ robotic assembly techniques. Installation errors are common." Schultz, Jr. et al. teaches that in order to solve these problems the electrical conductors and electrical terminals are encapsulated within synthetic resin.
- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to replace the wire harness with a circuit panel as taught by Schultz, Jr. et al. One would have been motivated to so modify the acknowledged prior art to prevent wiring errors when assembling the camera module.
- 12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M Gray whose telephone number is 703-308-1698. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T & T-F 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Russ Adams can be reached on 703-308-2847. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1782.

David M Gray Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2851